

QUT Digital Repository:
<http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>



Gagnon, Jean-Paul (2009) *Necessary but not sufficient : accelerating progress and looking beyond the MDGs*. In: Proceedings of the MDG Conference 2009, 30 November – 1 December 2009, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

© Copyright 2009 Jean-Paul Gagnon

ABSTRACT FOR LaTROBE UNIVERSITY'S MDG CONFERENCE

(Necessary but not sufficient– accelerating progress and looking beyond the MDGs)

The MDG deadline is fast approaching and the climate within the United Nations remains positive but skeptical. A common feeling is that a great deal of work and headway has been made, but the MDG goals will not be achieved in full by 2015. The largest problem facing the success of the MDGs is, and unless mitigated may remain, mismanaged governance. This argument is confirmed by a strong line of publications stemming from the United Nations and targeting methods (depending on a region or country context) such as improving governance via combating corruption, instituting accountability, peace and stability, as well as transparency. Furthermore, a logical assessment of the framework which MDGs operate in (i.e. international pressure and local civil socio-economic and/or political initiatives pushing governments to progress with MDGs) identifies the State's governing apparatus as the key to the success of MDGs. It is argued that a new analytic framework and grounded theory of democracy (the Element of Democracy) is needed in order to improve governance and enhance democracy. By looking beyond the confines of the MDGs and focusing on properly rectifying poor governance, the progress of MDGs can be accelerated as societies and their governments will be - at minimum - held more accountable to the success of programs in their respective countries. The paper demonstrates the logic of this argument - especially highlighting a new way of viewing democracy - and certain early practices which can accelerate MDGs in the short to medium term.

Name: Jean-Paul Gagnon

Institutional Affiliation: QUT, Humanities Program; MEDP, Director

Preferred form of Presentation: Plenary Contribution

INTRODUCTION

It is becoming increasingly clear that the UN, governments, international and local civil society, citizens, and other bodies are taking a targeted focus on improving governance (termed vaguely as ‘good governance’) for the improved success of the MDGs. But when it comes to improving governance, logistical problems emerge. The primary issue is the understanding of what democracy is (meaning a lacking practical definition) and what problems to focus on in the quest of good governance (meaning an uncoordinated approach to – and understanding of – good governance). What is needed is a shift of perspective to approach MDGs differently and provide a tangible future for them based on a general grounded theory for the improvement of governance via the mitigation of endemic problems which enhances democracy.

This general grounded theory is termed the ‘Element of Democracy’ and is the first practical and functional definition of democracy: in fact depicting it for what it is so as to establish a universal definition that can be utilized by any culture, in any official polity, and at any level of governance. The mitigation of endemic governance problems (an analytic perspective) is also a recent contribution to political science as it reveals seven problems that have been adversely affecting governments for at least the last 3500 years – and continue to affect governments today.

Although all of the endemic problems are being mitigated in a complex myriad of ways and contexts (with some like accountability and corruption dominating whilst long-term goals or constitutional issues are lacking) such is happening in an unconscious, disorganized, and implicit manner. MDGs would benefit from a shift of the implicit work for good governance (a concept based on a lack of understanding about democracy) to the explicit and coordinated work for enhancing democracy which would result in the improvement of government. The MDGs would be streamlined as issues of corruption, transparency, inefficient or insufficient bureaucratization, misappropriation of aid moneys, etc, would be mitigated.

The aforementioned will be seen through the explanation of what endemic governance problems and the element of democracy are; then dealing with some challenges to democracy; followed by a scrutiny of why governance is something that needs to be focused on for the benefit of MDGs; finishing with how a new universal definition of democracy and its problems can improve the success of MDGs. A brief section concerning the ‘utopian ideal’ of democracy has been included to exemplify the extreme of the perfect ideal so as to provide a moral gauge to this work.

ENDEMIC GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS

Presently, every country in the world is affected to various degrees by endemic governance problems. This includes local-to-State governance levels, and it is increasingly becoming

apparent that endemic problems affect non-governmental entities such as corporations, multinational organizations, and other institutions such as the military, hospitals, and banks. These problems not only affect present polities, but were also pests for Ancient Athenians, Romans, and latter day European governments through the Middle-Ages to the industrial period and beyond. It is probable that the problems affected polities before Attica consolidated the sovereignty of its empire, and might be present in Linear B texts as recorded by the Mycenaeans.¹

Accountability, transparency, corruption, representation, campaigning methods, constitutional issues, and long-term goals (or their lack thereof) are endemic problems for governments internationally – past and present (Gagnon, 2009).² In effect, all of them are being engaged to various degrees by civil societies, governments, media, etc, but not in an explicit and informed manner. Rather, the current international trend in democratization is to focus primarily on accountability, transparency, and corruption with a growing concern regarding representation and campaigning methods. Constitutional issues and long-term goals are, however, the smallest and least worked (Gagnon, 2009).

A contribution made to political science in *Improving Governance* (Gagnon, 2009) is the explicit and wholesale perspective of endemic problems: which realizes their history, that they are currently present in all polities, that they are inter-related and share complex relationships, and most notably – that they can improve democracy should one or more of them be mitigated.

Endemic problems were analyzed in a process involving a general foray into literature firmly established in democratic discourse. A preconceived notion that there are problems related to democracy guided the literature based scrutiny. It was during the general foray that the phenomenon occurred: regardless of a work's topic (be it democracy & corporations, Classical democracies, or economics, sustainable energy, and democracy) the same themes were being seen. This was how endemic governance problems took shape, gained context, and formed an analytic framework.

¹ Keane (2009) revealed that Assembly styled 'proto-democracy' was practiced as early as 3500 BCE by Mycenaeans, Phoenicians, and other polities in and around the Middle East. His book debunks the common myth that the Athenians were the inventors of democracy. Similarly, Diamond (1997, 2005) argued that the basic parts of democracy (such as communication) were endemic to human nature. Should that be the case, it is highly probable that endemic problems were just as prevalent in early governance systems as they were in the Athenian and Roman polities.

² This citation is not meant as a circular argument. Rather, the information it is supporting was a contribution made to political science via a doctoral thesis. It is cited here, in the place of the evidence accrued during the thesis to argue the point, as the evidentiary list would have been far too long.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

Academics and professionals have been trying to create an acceptable definition of democracy for hundreds of years but have been constantly refuted. The reason for this is that previous and current thinkers have been defining *styles* of democracy – not democracy itself. Whereas approximately between 1945 and 2000 democracy was viewed as an institutional affair linked to markets, history, or imperialism (which is still a commonly taught perspective); it is at present implicitly moving toward the idea that democracy is a cultural entity. That it must be derived from a pluralist citizenry, allowing them in a violence free environment to express their sovereignty to create new, use or adapt current or old institutions in what Keane (2009:160) calls “a form of human action shaped by institutional circumstances...and surprise.” The UNDP (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007) has recently pegged its working definition of democracy (as they are, *inter alia*, the democratization body of the UN) as violence free³ dialogue between a pluralist citizenry. Schmitt (1932) described his understanding of democracy as a precondition to governance, that it was something un-political and summed as the interaction between citizens and government. He used this viewpoint to attack liberal polities, as well as equality, and to defend authoritarianism in his quest to strengthen the Weimar government in turbulent paramilitary ridden post-WWI Germany. Although Schmitt (1932, 1932a, 1996, 1985, 2004), is critical of democracy for its weakness in the face of violence, his view that it is not a polity, but rather an organic condition that allows polity to happen is central.

Yet this implicit, culturally relevant (arising from Kofi Annan’s term as Secretary General of the UN), violence free, dialogue based, and un-political sense of democracy is intrinsically linked with pluralist sovereignty – which is only part of democracy. What was needed was to bring an explicit definition of democracy which is not far off from where the discourse has implicitly gone.

Bernstein (1993) asks it best:

What is democracy? The answer to this question appears very simple. It is translated as ‘government by the people’ and, by first glance, this would seem to settle it. But even a brief consideration tells us that this gives us only a very superficial and purely formal definition. Almost everyone who uses the term ‘democracy’ nowadays takes it to mean something more than just a form of government. We shall come much closer to the heart of the matter if we express ourselves negatively and define democracy as the absence of class government. This indicates a state of society in which no class has a political privilege which is opposed to the community as a whole. This also makes it immediately clear why a monopolistic corporation is anti-democratic. Furthermore, this negative definition has the advantage over the phrase ‘government by the people’ that it leaves less

³ Keane (2004) had written about the effect violence has on democracy nearing the end of Annan’s term which reflects the zeitgeist of democratic discourse in early 2000. Violence is the “democracy killer,” and its absence is intricately linked to the viability of pluralist sovereignty (versus populist).

room for the idea of the oppression of the individual by the majority, which is absolutely repugnant to the modern mind...As we understand it today, the concept of democracy includes an idea of justice, that is, equality of rights for all members of the community... (Bernstein, 1993:140-141)

Bernstein (1993) expresses the current dissatisfaction thinkers have with the general – and empty – line ‘government by the people’. Keane (2009) also showed (in Caudillo democracy) how a charismatic leader (Weber, 1947) could use the metanarrative (Lyotard, 1994) of ‘the people’ for purposes of demagoguery. Bernstein (1993) then continues to define his own style of democracy, again, not democracy itself.

It was the efforts of previous thinkers developing styles of democracy that permitted the following analysis to happen. It was also, most importantly, the perspective of endemic problems that led to the questioning of whether democracy has general endemic qualities about it. Since endemic problems are over three thousand years old, and affect all governments regardless of official political lineation, then perhaps democracy could have similar qualities (they are, after all, related).⁴

It came down to analyzing many major practiced, theorized, contemporary, and historical styles of democracy.⁵ Once the comparative thematic analysis was complete, it was seen that each democratic variant had themes that could be collapsed into larger categories. In other words, the same trees were being seen in the forest of democratic styles. Once the collapsing of categories (Charmaz, 2006)⁶ was complete, four distinct concepts were left: selecting officials⁷, equality, law⁸, and communication. Out of twenty-nine styles, there is not one that is not built on those four concepts.

⁴ This was ascertained via a reproducible empirical proximity analysis in Gagnon, 2009.

⁵ Styles of democracy analyzed: aristocratic, republican, Christian, Islamic, bourgeois, socialist, workers’, social, liberal, conservative, neo-lib, neo-con, representative, sortition, lot, consensus, parliamentary, majoritarian, presidential, interactive, direct, anarchist, e-democracy, global, corporate, Iroquois, consociational, assembly, and monitory.

⁶ “Now examine [categories] for their power, purpose, and patterns. Consider collapsing categories that lack power. Ask yourself: what purpose do they serve *here*?” (Charmaz, 2006:159)

⁷ Rather than the ‘selection of rulers’ as Keane (2009) showed there are no rulers in democracy.

⁸ Law, rather than the perhaps more defined ‘rule of law’ was chosen due to Schmitt (1932) and Keane (2009) in that laws are diverse and that in democracies there are no ‘rulers’. Legal positivism, teleocratic legislation, normative implicit customs, nomocratic statutes, precedent, civil codes, judicial review, executive vetoes, parliamentary bargaining, interest or pressure groups, top-down or bottom-up legal participation, etc, are all things that can impact the nature of a law. Schmitt (1932) argued the legitimacy of law was eroded by parliament as the deals struck ‘in house’ were foreign to the homogenous will that would be better represented by a popularly elected president. Although he has been shown wrong in his arguments over the last 60 years (notably that there is no such thing as a homogenous citizenry and that authoritarian violence can not function with democracy) he did open the way for Habermas (1996; Dyzenhaus, 1994) to argue that the level of citizen participation in the formation of laws is what provides its legitimacy. Hence the more inclusive the formation of laws are of the pluralist citizenry, the greater chance there is for law to reflect its heterogeneous will.

Why equality versus equity, law versus justice, selecting officials instead of elections, and communication rather than information? In that process of collapsing categories, it helped to have some reproducible information – which was attained from the frequency analysis conducted in **chapter eight** (Gagnon, 2009) of fourteen major multinational organization and international NGO documents dealing specifically with democracy.⁹ The other technique for refining categories was derived from Charmaz (2006) who argued that if there is no logical fit in the context of the argument, the concept should be collapsed. Thus selecting officials was chosen instead of elections because there are other methods of choosing who is or are to order and run government (not to rule in the conventional sense of sovereignty). Equality over equity as equity is implicit in equality, and that equality is a more pervasive term internationally than equity. This was the same case with law and justice. Furthermore, law is not as ambiguous as justice, and is something easier to define by a pluralist citizenry. Finally, communication houses all forms of the interaction of information and is logically a superior category, even if information was more pervasive than communication in the frequency analysis.

Yet, democracy is not simply the confluence of four concepts.¹⁰ It has to be attached to a body of power, and as the UNDP (Pruitt & Thomas, 2007), Keane (2009), and Annan have pointed, it rests with the sovereignty of the pluralist citizenry.

SOVEREIGNTY

The argument made herein is that pluralist sovereignty cannot be expressed or accessed in a culturally relevant, violence free, and long-term manner without engaging the process of selecting officials, equality, law, and communication. However, in order to understand what is meant, pluralist sovereignty is in need of some further refining.

Sovereignty traditionally meant the power of a monarch or state (post Westphalia) and still does (Krasner, 2001; Howland, 2008) although its traditional powers are increasingly threatened (Wenhua, 2008). Just as before the rise of representative democracies (and for a period near the decline of that style), the monarch or dictator was both sovereign and the state. Parliaments in their sovereign heyday could also be viewed in the same light (Young, 2008) as being the sovereign body – albeit ‘legitimized’ by elitist electors – mainly composing the state. However, things begin to muddle at this stage on three fronts: native peoples such as Amerindians are recognized as a sovereign people in treaties (Fixico, 2008:261; Shaw, 2008); theories of the ‘post-sovereign nation-state’ are emerging due to political pluralism and monitory democracy (Wissenburg, 2008; Keane, 2009); and the gradual widening of the franchise.

⁹ Mainly the UNDP, UN, Council for a Community of Democracies (CCD), Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU), Global Organization of Parliamentarians Against Corruption (GOPAC), World Bank, Parliamentary Centre, International IDEA, and Organization of American States (OAS).

¹⁰ In the proximity analysis (Gagnon, 2009), **chapter eight**, it was shown that selecting officials, law, equality, and communication are related terms.

Engaging Amerindians in the context of sovereignty revealed that First Nations did not practice typical European models of sovereignty, meaning that a recontextualisation of sovereignty occurred. The idea of a rather more egalitarian society such as the Iroquois gaining sovereign power (defined as their hold over a territory) contributes to the notion of pluralist sovereignty as power within the community was more diffuse thus sovereignty was accessing more individuals and interests. Political pluralism, its accountability, and promulgation – termed by Keane (2009) as monitory democracy – are viewed as a threat to the traditional sovereignty of the nation-state. In effect, the emergence of more ‘eyes and ears’ bodies both within and without the state is gradually removing the power of the state to rule, and in that way intrinsically affects its sovereignty. However, as Krasner (2001) explains, the nation-state has been adapting since its inception in 1648, and is adapting to the current ‘post-sovereign’ zeitgeist. Keane (2009:763-769) expressed that ‘über-democracy’ was the negative effect of this adaptation.

Change everybody’s sense of the short-term rhythm of electoral politics by planning for repeated victories. Aim to win several elections in a row, so that the rules of the political game and the whole atmosphere of public life can be changed. Act as if the principle of checks and balances is no longer meaningful. Mobilise every (dirty) trick in the book of politics to achieve what others haven’t achieved...a vital priority is executive control of political communication.
(Keane, 2009: 767, 766)

Yet, the beneficial result of monitory democracy and theories of the post-sovereign state is the focus of power elsewhere, namely toward the citizenry and supranational or multinational organizations. This, coupled with the recent explosion of communication technologies, explains the contemporary trend of activists targeting the WTO, IMF, G8 (20, 20+), as well as the increasing disaffection with the EU by European civil society and academics. Although Putnam (2000) writes that more individuals in America are ‘bowling alone’ rather than ‘bowling together’, in political terms the results of his study do not compute with the growing focus of sovereignty as composed of the many interests of a diverse society, or pluralist sovereignty. The main opposing argument to Putnam’s (2000) political work is Keane (2009) who depicts how monitory democracy and recent innovations in communication have in fact created far more opportunities to ‘bowl’ alone or together due to the proliferation of civil society locally through to internationally.

Finally, the widening of the franchise over the past 200 years has furthered the idea that individuals are the units which compose the sovereign. Equality of gender, ethnicity¹¹, sexuality, etc, contributed to the notion of pluralism and dispelled the myth of the majority, or in other words, ‘the people’. That is the last distinction for pluralist sovereignty to be made clear. Popular (populist) sovereignty (Lupel, 2009) in its basic form means that people are the source of

¹¹ As opposed to race: recent archaeological findings posit that all humans are from the same race (genetically speaking) and that differences in appearance are solely matters of ethnicity.

political legitimacy. The trouble is that it returns to the explicit use of ‘people’; that same term hijacked and abused by demagogues over the past 200 years. Pluralist¹² sovereignty, on the other hand, dispels the myth of an existing explicit body of the ‘people’ and places power with diverse individuals which when configured geographically, form a complex political milieu, hence the implicit – non mythical – notion of the people.¹³

THE ELEMENT OF DEMOCRACY

Pluralist sovereignty is the core of democracy, and as previously stated, cannot be expressed or accessed without being ‘wrapped’ in its four democratic particles: selecting officials, equality, law, and communication. With that frame in place, a citizenry or government can then enhance democracy by increasing the cultural relevancy of its institutions and mitigating endemic problems.

As endemic problems are universal pests for governments, and that they are related to democracy’s four particles, the element of democracy (that grounded theory of pluralist sovereignty ‘wrapped’ by its four particles) is as equally pervasive. A mixed constitutions approach – borrowed from Hellenistic thinkers – was required to view it as such. Diamond (1997, 2005) argued that dialogue (communication), equality, and order (selecting officials & law) are endemic to human nature: this is the archeo-anthropologic argument which Keane (2009) nearly touched upon. Keane (2009) contributes to Diamond’s (1997, 2005) work by revealing assemblies were prevalent by about 2500 BCE in and around the Middle East. Together, the evidence allows democracy to be understood as endemic to human nature (reminding of Schmitt’s un-political democracy). It is typically when power is perverted by violence, hawkish groups, and warring civilizations, that democracy is suppressed, but not eliminated. It is in this way that democracy is viewed to be a constant element in governments, regardless of official or unofficial political lineation and that a variety of styles can be present in any given polity depending on how individuals or groups are expressing their sovereignty. This is so because democracy is the mechanism that allows a pluralist citizenry to govern themselves. It is what allows polities to emerge and the effectiveness of the polity (society’s organization) depends on how it addresses democracy’s four particles. For if it addresses them poorly, pluralist sovereignty is ineffectually expressed which leads to political discontent.

¹² Connolly (Chambers, 2007) argues capitalism to have ‘minoritized’ society in his description of pluralism, whereas pluralism in this work is not related to economic postulation but is rather tied to the notion of debunking the ‘myth of the majority’.

¹³ It should however be mentioned that an explicit majority concerning a well defined concept could be attained via improved census methods and improved political communication. Yet, for the majority to be legitimate, it would have to contain the agreement of most if not all individuals composing the pluralist body with comfortable space for minorities to argue their opinions until a normative agreement can be reached.

This perspective lends a universal aspect to democracy which fits with the history and pervasiveness of endemic problems. It allows the aforementioned ‘nexus’ of democratic particles and endemic problems to work theoretically and empirically.

A NEW DEFINITION OF DEMOCRACY

As such, democracy is defined as an ever present element in any government (existing in China, Burma, Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, Zimbabwe, the DRC, etc). It is pluralist sovereignty expressed by selecting officials, equality, law, and communication. It is not whatsoever an institution such as voting, parliaments, or presidents, but it is a culturally distinct entity.¹⁴ It is present as the root in every style of democracy, and is active at any level of governance, from local to global. Ultimately, it is a general tool which enables a pluralist citizenry to create a culturally distinct style of governance based on their definitions of selecting officials, equality, law, and communication. Whether that means a monarchy, anarchy, parliament, oligarchy, etc, if conducted in a long-term manner without oppressing any disaffected citizens, a government would be a culturally relevant style of democracy.

The trouble is, actually obtaining such an outcome from a long-term all-inclusive process has never been done before, and is likely not something that can be achieved in the near future. That is explicitly. This process is something that occurs every day, but in an implicit and unconscious manner. Democracy, just like endemic problems, is currently – and always has been – an ongoing process. People are engaging in dialogue, changing or creating new laws, challenging authority, and seeking equality every day in a myriad of contexts. Democracy is active everywhere, and it is affected by endemic problems, only that it has been living implicitly – through the unattached and random actions of billions from past and present, only now for the first time it has been recognized explicitly.

CHALLENGES TO DEMOCRACY

Although Nietzsche’s (2008, 2008a), thoughts on truth and utility ultimately contribute to the ontology of this work, he was critical of 19th century European styled democracy. Due to his somewhat inconsistent writing style (in that he tends to muddle things together in his rather hawkish prose) it is only after going through the majority of his works that his critiques of democracy become pronounced.

His view of morality was influenced by Homeric values where good was “wealth, strength, health, and power...whereas badness becomes associated with the poor, weak, sick, and

¹⁴ Institutions are what give democracy its flavor or style, enabling it to function as a pluralist and culturally distinct sovereignty would want it to.

pathetic” (Nietzsche, 2008:115). He also held a misogynistic view of women, when stating “the weaker sex has in no previous age been treated with so much respect by men as at present—this belongs to the tendency and fundamental taste of democracy, in the same way as is respectfulness to old age--what wonder is it that abuse should be immediately made of this respect? They want more, they learn to make claims, the tribute of respect is at last felt to be well-nigh galling; rivalry for rights, indeed actual strife itself, would be preferred: in a word, woman is losing modesty. And let us immediately add that she is also losing taste. She is unlearning to FEAR man: but the woman who "unlearns to fear" sacrifices her most womanly instincts” (Nietzsche, 2008:71).

His comments are relevant to the times he lived in. European representative styled democracies were in majority inclusive only of propertied men with women and the poor engaged in the process of gaining the franchise and increasing their civil liberties. Nietzsche (2008, 2008a) himself sought, it appears, satisfaction in the knowledge that he was a descendant of Polish nobility¹⁵ which furthers his aristocratic leanings and Hellenistic mistrust of ‘the masses’ and women. Thus the way he viewed what was then believed to be democracy (probably a mixture of parliaments filled with turbulent rabble-rousers which in turn occupied local Assemblies and terrorized the ‘rational’ minorities) was contemptuous.¹⁶

Misarchism (Siemens, 2009:242), or the hatred of rule, is another of Nietzsche’s critiques. Siemens (2009) shares that Nietzsche – as previously stipulated – was an aristocrat and believed in the superiority of wealth over poverty, male over female, and strong over weak which inherently rested on the need for strong rulers “for the sake of enhancement” (Siemens, 2009:242). However, misarchy is a component of pluralist sovereignty (as is non-violence) because democracy does not deal in sovereign rulers, aristocrats, or oligarchies. This “rule of no thing over nothing else” is especially apparent in the current growing style of monitory democracy (Keane, 2009:856-857).

Nietzsche also claims democracy to be ruled by herd-morality, or a “social reality” of the masses (Taureck, 2009:200). In this he is embroiled, as were a host of other thinkers during his time, in the myth of the majority. Even if individuals may act in groups – perhaps establishing the phenomena of ‘herding’¹⁷ in unique situations – this group is still a minority as it is composed heterogeneously of individuals. The threat of the ‘masses’ was a threat to aristocratic living as the disparity of social circumstances did not provide a large number of people with the

¹⁵ His Polish noble ancestry was most probably involved in the creation of an aristocratic democracy that governed the Polish-Lithuanian Empire from roughly the 15th to 17th centuries (Keane, 2009:257-263).

¹⁶ This contempt for democracy is not surprising as Classical thinkers (Aristotle, Socrates, Plutarch, etc) were critical of democracy. Their arguments were subsequently taken up again in Europe, especially after the Protestant revolution and the creation or opening of existing universities for the education of the wider public.

¹⁷ The act of subconsciously reacting or behaving in a manner not conducive to the normative behaviour of an individual due to the actions of others in a group (i.e. stampeding, rioting, etc).

means to be educated. The belief was that should government be opened to ‘unqualified’ electors, the state would be doomed by the stupidity, violence, and ignorance of the riff-raff. The fact that the individuals which compose populations termed as ‘poor’ are increasingly being focused on by governments and multinational organizations internationally disproves Nietzsche’s argument that democracy cannot work because of the social reality of the herd-mentality (Taurek, 2009:201).

Another viewpoint in part related to herd-morality is Nietzsche’s (2008, 2008a) notion that ‘radical insecurity’ is ultimately necessary for the enhancement of the ‘human plant’. Democracy mitigates radical insecurity due to its stabilizing and secure habits which are necessary for diminishing violence.

One will look in vain for such human beings of great creativity, the actual great humans, as I understand it, today and probably for a long time to come: they are lacking; until finally, after much disappointment, one must begin to understand why they are lacking, and that nothing stands more inimically in the way of their emergence and development for now and for a long time yet than that which one now in Europe calls simply “the morality”: as if there were no other and could be no other – that herd-morality [...], which with all its powers strives after the general green pasture-happiness on earth, namely security, lack of danger, comfort, lightness of living and in the end, “when all is going well”, also hopes to rid itself of all manner of shepherd and leader [Leithammel]. Their two most frequently preached teachings are: “Equality of rights” and “Compassion for all that suffers” – and suffering itself is taken by them as something that one must abolish altogether. (Siemens, 2009:244)

The abolishment of suffering Nietzsche (2008, 2008a) claims to be the responsibility of the shepherd or leader and criticizes democracy for then wanting to dispense with the shepherd for equality. In pluralist sovereignty, each individual is a shepherd or a sheep, a leader or a follower, a political *Übermensch*¹⁸ that is not ruled and that cannot rule but rather can exercise an office should such be approved by his or her peers, or challenge law should the law be felt unjust. His argument that the ‘masses’ need a leader holds no water as it has time and again lined the path of demagoguery, dictators, and Caudillo styled leadership. He similarly critiques the effects of equality as declining ‘organizing power’.

As it turns out, the only institutions that we late moderns are able to support are the liberal institutions that Nietzsche sneeringly associates with the spread of democracy, which he regards not as an alternative form of government but as the ‘form of decline in organizing power’ (TI Expeditions 39). While he has many disparaging things to say about liberal institutions (cf. TI Expeditions 37– 43),

¹⁸ The *Übermensch* (or ‘super-man’) is Nietzsche’s (2008, 2008a) ideal post-nihilist and post-Christian man that creates his own reasons for living and does not succumb to the imposters of joy and sorrow but rather stays in a state like Zen. In this case, *Übermensch* was adapted as a political individual who does not succumb to power or subordination but rather maintains a state of pluralist sovereignty.

their chief political failing is that they are unable to support the production and advancement of culture. As such, they are unable to contribute directly to the enhancement of the human type. (Conway, 2009:41)

The evident capacity of humans to innovate in periods of heightened democracy disproves the need for sovereign leaders to provide a guiding hand. Whereas measures that turn to concentrating power in an institution or personage in times of crisis reflects naught but poor governance in terms of risk assessment and preparedness (here critiquing Schmitt).

Finally, Nietzsche's (2008, 2008a) famous line 'God is dead'¹⁹ poses a challenge to the notion of the Element of Democracy and endemic governance problems as general or universal grounded theories. Rather than speculating further about the anthropological endemic qualities of democratic particles, or trying to prove that the truth of the element of democracy and endemic governance perspectives will still be true (hence useful) in 500 years (which is doubted), the aforementioned are general grounded theories firstly by the fact that the empirical results which permitted their statements to be made can be reproduced by any scholar. Secondly, that they were derived from an exhaustive historical and theoretical analysis. And thirdly, that because the empirical evidence they were drawn from is contemporary and hence useful (thus true) to modern international politics – at least for the near future.²⁰

Weber's (2004) notion of the state and the charismatic leader does not necessarily have to be viewed as critiques of democracy. In its simplest terms, Weber (2004) views the state as a body holding the legitimate right over power and its use. This view can be transposed in the pluralist sovereignty framework in that the state is the composition of institutions created by a pluralist citizenry and as such derives its legitimacy to use power. However, this does not disavow the state's responsibility to remain accountable for its use of power via the scrutiny of the pluralist citizenry, intrastate civil society and other bodies such as the media, as well as supranational bodies. The necessity of having a charismatic leader, or politician that is somewhat distanced or 'disinterested' in his or her *subjects* is a viewpoint, if related today, that is retrograded and non-conducive to current progressive political thought. As stipulated before with Nietzsche, Weber lived in the height of the representative style of democracy and ultimately witnessed the beginning of its decline (WWI). He did not experience the contemporary ill-effects of charismatic leadership nor monitory democracy (which rejects citizens as subjects), however, he should have been more critical given the French revolution's experiences with leaders chock full of charisma and *realpolitik* (i.e. Napoleon).

A problem in Weber's (1968) thought is his overdependence on parliaments. He argued that charismatic leadership would become rationalized (although he claims charisma is anti-authoritarian which Schmitt rejects) thus leading to entrenched bureaucratization. Parliaments

¹⁹ This statement in fact lines the way for Nihilism and the belief that nothing is universal, that there is no reason for life, and that there are no general principles to live by (as Christianity attempted this for nearly two thousand years but failed).

²⁰ The argument utilized relates to Nietzsche's notion of perspectivism in that there can be a variety of perspectives that could be utilized to view something (such as democracy) but also that a perspective may be more valid than others depending on its utility.

would then keep bureaucracies efficient and hence keep the system running.²¹ The trouble is, this viewpoint is specific to the Weimar condition in that parliament was the only other power that could order the state and keep it from dissolving into civil war or outright violent anarchy spurned on by paramilitary political wings (communists v. NSDP for example) by making bureaucracy more efficient. But this overdependency on the resilience of parliament – and the perspective of humans that Weber held – was shown insufficient in ordering society as the Weimar republic died and became subverted by the NSDP. Hence, parliament and political parties are not the major salve in dissuading the inefficient mechanization of politics (as Weber, 1968, argued).

However, inefficient bureaucratization is a bear-bug for any governmental system as bureaucrats are the individuals that turn the wheels of the pluralist citizenry's institutions. If such is done inefficiently then governance cannot operate effectively but rather at a disaffecting pace. Efficient bureaucratization is also an important factor for governments as it is these very institutions that most citizens – in most cases – interact with rather than the officials they have selected to run government. Keane (2009) shows that political pluralism is what keeps the institutions of government (its bureaucracies) accountable – not just parliament. A strong civil society and advanced information technology was not available to Weber which is why his insistence on parliament is rational, but misplaced.

Schmitt uses his own idea of democracy to combat liberalism, pluralism, and the rule of law (Kalyvas, 2008:82). He defines democracy as the “identity between the state and people” (Schmitt, 1985a:26) whereas democracy is herein seen as an ever present form of government which enables pluralist citizens to express their sovereignty by forming institutions, laws, and processes that in turn forms the state – which is not entirely alien to his concept of the unpolitical aspect of democracy. In other words, democracy permits a style of governance to emerge which pictures the state as the powerless²² framework which orders the pluralist citizenry based on their wants rather than having wants imposed on them by a dictator. Schmitt's thoughts on the benefits of a dictator or more precisely an individual that has the ‘emergency powers’ to act above the law (rather for expediency) is excusive. Democracy is a malleable form of governance that can adapt to situations by the driven genius of its citizens. Emergency powers can be defined and individuals can be protected by instituted accountability measures, rather than relying on a dictator and his or her powers of the ‘exceptional’ (Schmitt, 1965a:28, 82).

Schmitt does not effectively use democracy to battle liberalism primarily for the reason that his understanding of democracy as capable of supporting authoritarianism was false, and secondly for the reason that he used his own *style* of democracy to do battle with *styles* of liberal democracy – not democracy itself. His challenges to pluralism (1985a), the rule of law (1996a), legal positivism (1932), and essentially the capacity of the ‘masses’ to engage politically, stem from an authoritarian perspective that was influenced primarily by Weimar aristocratic republicanism and later by fascism and totalitarianism – both of which engaged in demagoguery to win the day and dictatorship to ruin it. He forwards the standard Hellenistic inspired distaste of populist government driven by the mythical fear of the majority backed by Weimar

²¹ As the Parliament is the highest echelon of bureaucracy and is in the best position to modify it.

²² Powerless in the sense that the state – or the officials that compose it – does not have a legitimate authority (in a democracy) to break laws or harm its citizens.

militarism, Italian Fascism, and Nazi totalitarianism – however, his critiques of liberalism, constitutional democracy, parliaments, etc, enabled the theoretical establishment of democracy as the previously stated government forming mechanism.

Finally, Schmitt argues that in cases of the ‘exceptional’ the capacity of shifting the sovereign to a dictator from the ‘people’²³ also gave the state the legitimate use of violence. Schmitt tried to link democracy in his works to presidential-based unaccountable violence but failed as violence is anathema to democracy (Keane, 2009) and hence is ruinous of pluralist sovereignty and in that line of thought there cannot exist an effective violent democracy: such would only produce a violent style of government. Actual democracy provides conditions in which no one thing rules over anything else (Keane, 2009) and as such disproves Schmitt’s critiques.

THE UTOPIAN DEMOCRACY

In a perfect – explicit – polity, individuals would have the practical means to express their sovereignty. All institutions would work through specifically designed channels of communication to mitigate endemic problems in the effort of enhancing democratic particles. And democracy would be understood and utilized for what it is, the expression of pluralist sovereignty and the culturally relevant organization of society.

Individuals would have the capacity to collectively agree to select officials in the style that best suits them; law would be relevant to its heterogeneous society after having been gradually reviewed through a long-term inclusive process; political communication would be made easier through the installment of standard government provided software connecting the individual with the institutions he or she is interested in; and the citizenry’s definition of equality would be made clear through the agreement of all citizens heavily backed by equity programs. Furthermore, all institutions would be democratized in this sense, thus streamlining government and allowing it to improve the condition of its citizens as well as furthering the aims of the citizenry.

Heterogeneous, pluralist, and misarchy would replace homogenous, populist, and the sovereign state. That particular shift in the understanding of power democratizes the polity of the state. No longer will a 51% ‘majority’ overrule a 49% ‘minority’ as such does not legitimize a polity’s action but rather exhibits a rift within the plural citizenry which requires discussion and resolution.²⁴ The common criticism that democracy is too slow, that it often ‘misses the boat’

²³ Recalling that the use of this term up until post-1945 engaged the ‘myth of the majority’ and often meant a limited male franchise.

²⁴ A government passed on 51%, or a law instituted on 60% reflects a poor result. Governance, legality, and legitimacy can be compared to the results given to a student. Should the pupil receive a mark in the fiftieth percentile, such reflects a poor effort and lack of knowledge. Obviously, if the pupil scores higher he or she has

due to too much deliberation and deadlock, is not a reason for vesting power into the executive but rather depicts a flaw in a polity's legal planning and archaic communication. Measures would be in place to systematically deal with emergencies backed by non-corruptible accountability, and ICTs would be appropriately utilized to allow citizens, and other political bodies, to engage in discussions so as to maximize discourse and provide the best decision possible.

ENGAGING THE 'SHIFT'

The capacity to shift towards enhanced democracy in an explicit manner is available. Academics, professionals, multinational organizations, international and local civil society, as well as citizens continuously engage in the process of enhancing democracy – but only in a disconnected and unconscious manner (hence implicit). By utilizing the grounded theory of the Element of Democracy and engaging the endemic governance problems perspective, this shift can consciously occur. There are a variety of mechanisms²⁵ already in use, or that can be used, to begin the explicit shift. This enhancement of democracy is what multinationals, governments, media, civil society, and citizens should focus on for the improvement of governance, and ultimately the success of the MDGs.

WHY GOVERNANCE NEEDS TO BE FOCUSED ON

It is thus far understood what democracy is, that it is negatively affected by endemic governance problems, and that due to its universal nature is a useful perspective to engage the improvement of governance in any country and at any level of governance. But why should governance be focused on when it comes to MDGs?

Vandemoortele (2009:2) states that “The original MDG agenda never implied a specific development strategy or policy framework. Defining such a strategy or framework belongs to the realm of sovereign policy-making at the country level.” His highlighting that “Bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, nongovernmental organisations, private foundations and think-tanks

provided a good effort and exhibits the appropriate degree of knowledge. Why then can a government or law operate in such low percentiles and claim legitimacy from an election? A coalition comprising 55% of the vote is not a majority. A political party winning 100% of the vote is not a majority either as it is composed of an undemocratic power structure exhibiting many values but obviously unable to enact them due to power-brokering, ‘whipping’ from senior party leaders, that only X percent of the pluralist citizenry voted, and the realpolitik of parliaments in that something most often must be given for something else. Governance is (in most cases) pithily, a bad student and is logically not legitimate as it fails to engage pluralist sovereignty at even a passable level. Asimov's lament (“the saddest aspect of life right now is that science gathers knowledge faster than society gathers wisdom”) is evidently still contemporarily relevant.

²⁵ Some of which are suggested in Gagnon, 2009. Ex. Information technology is severely under-utilized and ‘behind the times’ when it comes to governance, which is affecting the communication particle.

must de-emphasise the dimension of ‘money changing hands’ in managing development co-operation [and] a partnership among equals will come about only if the focus shifts towards ‘ideas changing minds’” is a good shift away from donor-centric and money-centric viewpoints. He drives home his point that developing countries need to focus on “infrastructure, institutions, capacity and good governance. Such investments need to be sustained over long periods of time before they yield a measurable impact. Until these prerequisites fall in place, a country will make only modest progress [on MDGs], if any” (2009:7).

Furthermore, Fiji Times (2007) reports that safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, maternal health, child mortality, and nutrition are major areas of disparity. Donor aid can only go so far if the government and its institutions are piecemeal or defective. Both government and donors need to operate on the same framework which is currently lacking due as aforementioned to a misunderstanding of democracy and good governance.

UNECE, UNICEP, & UNDP (2008) discuss the need for better statistics to be provided by governments so that multinational organizations, local civil society, universities, and think-tanks can work more efficiently. High quality information in the form of statistical data is a prerequisite for any government to function, yet census methodologies are strikingly archaic concerning the availability of ICTs that allow for a wider range of information to be gleaned from the citizenry. The ‘super-census’ is a useful tool for governments to maintain in-depth information on its pluralist citizenry (Gagnon, 2009). Its focus is on establishing a long-term, ‘bottom-up’ approach with the goal being of surveying the entire body of citizens (beyond voting age) in a given territory with far more questions asked.

These kind of statistics can aide the MDGs by permitting governing institutions to understand the political geography of the plural citizenry. The UN’s Deputy Secretary-General Migiro states: “all UN agencies and organizations working in Africa in support of the African Union and its NEPAD programme [must] work together, at the global, regional and sub-regional levels, as one United Nations family to seek common solutions to these challenges” (News Feed, 2008). Not only is governance a problem in developing countries, but clearly also for the UN itself.

As if fulfilling Vandemoortele’s (2009) suggestions, the UNDP’s democratization efforts reflect a ‘light-touch’ approach when their services are requested by a member-state to improve governance. Their focus is on promoting dialogue, equality, anti-corruption, representation, transparency, legislation, and justice (the rule of law). Yet the definition or style of democracy the UNDP proposes is based primarily on peaceful dialogue (2007:xiii) and although their work makes use of all seven endemic problems, it is done inadvertently. If the UNDP and other aid bodies as well as countries seeking aid used the endemic problems perspective and the element of democracy theory they would be addressing the common issues all parties implicitly engage in and thus help streamline process whilst still providing that ‘light-touch’ technique which promotes a culturally relevant democracy to emerge for a country’s pluralist citizenry.

LACKING FOCUS

The obverse side of those calling for focus on good governance is the current call for more aid financing. There are also calls from personages such as Donnelly (2009) who focuses on the economic crisis, climate change, rising food prices, and a drop in remittances as factors stressing MDGs. She argues the need for donor countries to continue giving aid to developing countries. Yet presupposing development aid to be sufficient for meeting MDGs without mentioning aid effectiveness or how governments are held accountable for the money they receive is irresponsible and inefficient (Vandermoorle, 2009).

Gunter, Rahman, and Shi (2009) focus on the need for a different debt-carrying framework. They argue that a new framework could result in more LDCs taking on donor-based debt resulting in greater MDG progress. Although any scheme to put an LDC as the major beneficiary in a loan is welcome, and that such a scheme could keep LDCs from seeking loans domestically and from other – perhaps less scrupulous – agencies may reduce cross-border conflicts or domestic strife, the authors' donor-centric, and money-centric focus is logical in the current framework. The authors (2009:282) argue, however, that empirical evidence shows "economic growth, and therefore the likelihood of reducing income poverty, is strongly influenced by the quality of policies and institutions," hence governance. Bad governance gets bad aid, and vice versa.

Deen (2008) reports that the food crisis, recent financial crisis, rising oil prices, and insufficient funding from donor countries is what is currently plaguing developing countries ability to meet the MDGs. Mpuga (2008) writes that donors are spending 25 billion a year importing food (this cost is on the rise) whilst only giving 2 billion a year to Africa which is insufficiently, or inappropriately investing in local agriculture despite the fact that nearly 60% of most African citizens live in rural areas. "According to the International Food Policy Research Institute, the world's poorest people, are, and will be hardest hit by the global rise in food prices. The Washington-based body says poor people in developing countries spend more than half of their overall budget on food. "For the 160 million people worldwide who survive on less than 50 cents a days, food price inflation will spell disaster." says a May 16 statement from the organization" (Mulama, 2008). Marsden et al (2009) argue that governance (hence societal organization) is needed to regulate supply chains and to assist the private sector in managing them. Goodhart (2009) discusses how the global financial crisis (GFC) revealed regulatory failings in government. Asplund (2008) reveals how energy is shifting from carbon based on renewable and that governments can go a far way to ease the shift into new power generation. Finally, the accountability of money provided by donors – and notably the measurement of its effects on the ground – is not an issue resolved. Corruption still plagues the UN and all of its member states which explains the need of the recent Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) and Rome Declaration (2003). As can be seen, the major issues concerning MDGs expressed internationally all revolve around governance.

Another key global concern regards MDG 5, the increasing of maternal, new born, and child health. Shankar et al (2008) stipulate that it is the increase in health management based on appropriate statistics which will allow those bodies capable of improving health to act accordingly. Traditionally, the domain of health lies with government as the question of MDG 5 not only lies with hospitals, but sanitation, education, and the regulations necessary to keep those institutions accountable, transparent, and corruption free.

MDGs, ENDEMIC PROBLEMS AND DEMOCRACY

As can be seen, there is a call for – and need of – an increased focus on improving governance for the success of the MDGs. There is a lot of talk about democracy, and a lot of money being devoted to it, the trouble is, the institutions engaging democracy have an inappropriate understanding of it. Ask a hundred people, and a hundred different definitions of democracy may be given. Such disparities in understanding are breeding grounds for miscommunication and inefficiency. This is due to the fact that there is no agreed upon definition of democracy as those trying to define it still did not understand what it actually is. The utility of having a practical universal working definition of democracy and its endemic problems will allow a culturally defined ‘good government’ to emerge and as such streamline society which in so doing will contribute to the success of MDGs. The same thing can be said for various UN organizations working together as they will finally have a common understanding of democracy and be able to work on the same page as Migiro (News Feed, 2008) called for.

CONCLUSION

It was seen that MDGs can be more successful if governance is focused on using a proper understanding of democracy and its endemic problems as poor governance is blamed for, inter alia, the misappropriation of aid moneys, corruption, poor health regulation, and non-accountability. With democracy now defined and properly perceived, as well as a perspective of its key problems, the increasing call for ‘good governance’ by the UN in their MDGs quest has been answered. The move from unconsciously mitigating endemic problems on incorrect (and diverse) understandings of democracy to a common ground conscious of understanding democracy and its problems is achieved.

This was done by briefly explaining the long-standing phenomena of endemic problems as well as the fact that they adversely affect democracy; defining democracy with a universal grounded theory (the Element of Democracy)²⁶; depicting the emerging focus for good governance; and finally explaining how a new definition of democracy and mitigating endemic

²⁶ This process involved the discussion of sovereignty, the Element of Democracy theory, challenges to democracy, and the ‘utopian’ ideal.

governance problems would bolster the success of MDGs by providing an explicit understanding of what it is to improve governance.

The aforementioned is important for the future of MDGs since it is unproductive to have various bodies which are meant to collude and work together (i.e. UN, local civil society, media, and government institutions) that have their own understanding of what democracy is. This leads to an uncoordinated approach to providing 'good governance'. By perceiving endemic problems, statistics and performance evaluations can be aligned to appropriately measure the degree that democracy is being enhanced. The culturally distinct form of democracy would hence emerge (based on the definitions the plural citizenry has of the four democratic particles) and society's progress would quicken.

These are but some of the many imaginable and realistic effects appropriately engaging democracy could have. Further research is needed concerning the visual representation of governments based on the Element of Democracy and endemic problems; gauging the effect mitigating one or more endemic problems has on democracy; and certainly debating the theoretical claims made herein.

WORKS CITED

- Asplund, R. W. 2008. *Profiting from Clean Energy: A Complete Guide to Trading Green in Solar, Wind, Ethanol, Fuel Cell, Power Efficiency, Carbon Credit Industries, and More*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chambers, S. A., and T. Carver. 2007. *William E. Connolly: Democracy, Pluralism, and Political Theory*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Conway, D. 2009. The Birth of the State. *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. eds. H. W. Siemens, V. Roodt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Deen, T. Sept 26, 2008. Development: Most Nations see Hopes Dim from Making MDG Date. *Global Information Network*. New York.
- Diamond, J. 1997. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. USA: W. W. Norton.
- Diamond, J. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. USA: Viking Press.
- Donnelly, C. Jul. 7, 2009. Development: MDG Goals Face 'Triple Crisis', *Global Information Network*. New York.
- Dyzenhaus, D. 1994. The Legitimacy of Legality: Review of Habermas, *Faktizität und Geltung*. *University of Toronto Law Journal*. 46:129-80.
- Fiji Times, Oct 9, 2007. MDG Pressures Uneven. *Australia/New Zealand Reference Center*.
- Foucault, M. 1974. Human Nature: Justice Versus Power. *Reflexive Water: The Basic Concerns of Mankind*. ed. Fons Elders, 133-197. London: Souvenir Press.
- Gagnon, JP. 2009. *Improving Governance: Practical Methods and an Analytic Framework for the Enhancement of Democracy*. Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology.
- Goodhart, C. A. E. 2009. *The Regulatory Response to the Financial Crisis*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gunter, G. B., Rahman, J., Shi, H. 2009. Linking Social Development with the Capacity to Carry Debt: Towards an MDG-Consistent Debt-Sustainability Concept. *Development Policy Review*. 27 (3), 269-282.
- Habermas, J. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. trans. W. Rehg. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kalyvas, A. 2008. *Democracy and the Politics of the Extraordinary: Max Weber, Carl Schmitt, and Hannah Arendt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keane, J. 2009. *The Life and Death of Democracy*. London: Simon & Schuster.

- Kelly, M. G. E. 2009. *The Political Philosophy of Michel Foucault*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Marsden, T., R. Lee, A. Flynn, and S. Thankappan. 2009. *The New Regulation and Governance of Food: Beyond the Food Crisis?* Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- McCormick, P. 2004. An Introduction to Carl Schmitt's *Legality and Legitimacy*. *Legality and Legitimacy*. trans. J. Seitzer. London: Duke University Press.
- Mpuga, D. Sept 24, 2008. VOA News: Wealthy Nations yet to Fulfill MDG Pledge. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*. Washington, DC.
- Mulama, J. June 20, 2008. Security: Civil Society Warns Food Crisis Can Erode MDG Gains. *Global Information Network*. New York.
- News Feed, Oct 21, 2008. Global Financial Crisis, Food Shortage and Climate Change Could Derails Africa's MDG Prospects, says UN Deputy Secretary-General Migiro. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*. Washington, DC.
- Nietzsche, F. 2008. *Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*. transl. H. Zimmern. Boston: MobileReference.com
- Nietzsche, F. 2008a. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Boston: MobileReference.com
- Pruitt, B., P. Thomas. eds. 2007. *Democratic Dialogue: A Handbook for Practitioners*. UNDP, New York.
- Schmitt, C. 1932. *Legalität und Legitimität*. Munich and Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot.
- Schmitt, C. 1932a. *Der Begriff des Politischen*. Munich and Leipzig: Duncker und Humblot.
- Schmitt, C. 1985. *Political Theology*. trans. G. Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, C. 1985a. *The Crisis of Parliamentary Democracy*. trans. E. Kennedy. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Schmitt, C. 1996. *The Concept of the Political*. trans. G. Schwab. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schmitt, C. 1996a. *The Leviathan in the State Theory of Thomas Hobbes: Meaning and Failure of a Political Symbol*. trans. G. Schwab & E. Hilfstein. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Schmitt, C. 2004. *Legality and Legitimacy*. trans. J. Seitzer. London: Duke University Press.
- Shankar, A., L. Bartlett, V. Fauveau, M. Islam, and N. Terreri. Dec 2008. Delivery of MDG 5 by Active Management with Data. *Lancet*. Vol 371, Iss 9620: 1223-1224.

Siemens, H. W., and V. Roodt. eds. 2009. *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Siemens, H. W. 2009. Yes, No, Maybe So...Nietzsche's Equivocations on the Relation Between Democracy and Grosse Politik. *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. eds. H. W. Siemens, V. Roodt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Taureck, B. H. E. 2009. Nietzsche's Reasoning against Democracy: Why He Uses the Social Herd Metaphor and Why He Fails. *Nietzsche, Power and Politics: Rethinking Nietzsche's Legacy for Political Thought*. eds. H. W. Siemens, V. Roodt. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

UNECE, UNICEP, UNDP. 2008. *Assessment of capacity for countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia to produce MDG-relevant statistics*. New York: United Nations Publications.

Vandemoortele, J. Jul. 2009. The MDG Conundrum: Meeting the Targets Without Missing the Point. *Development Policy Review*. 27 (4), 355-371.

Weber, M. 2004. *The Vocation Lectures*. eds D. Owen, T. B. Strong. Trans, R. Livingstone. Indianapolis: Hackett Pub.

Weber, M. 1994. *Political Writings*. ed. P. Lassman, and R. Speirs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, M. 1968. *Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building*. ed. S. N. Eisenstadt. Chicago: Chicago University Press.